



PCAG

Perchlorate Community Advisory Group



MEETING MINUTES

Friday, November 3, 2006

2:00 – 4:00 PM

San Martin Lions Club Hall (12415 Murphy Avenue)

I. Pledge of Allegiance

II. Administrative Items

- A. Introductions
- B. Attendee Sign-In Sheet - Chairperson Sylvia Hamilton encouraged people to write their name and contact information on the sign-in sheet if they have changes and/or would like to receive information from and about PCAG.
- C. Open Forum – None
- D. Approve October 6, 2006 meeting minutes as corrected. In section III B. 1. b.) we revise the last sentence to: “cleanup to background is determined to be economically infeasible” and any “Comments” section in III B. changed to “PCAG Committee Comments”.
- E. Additional Agenda Topics
- F. 2007 PCAG Meeting Dates are now available

III. Presentations/Discussions

- A. Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Update (Eric Gobler)

Monitoring that will continue to occur has been put together in a fact sheet. Eric is asking PCAG for feedback on 3 areas:

 - Would a Fact Sheet helpful?
 - How much information should it include?
 - a. History
 - b. Bottled water vs. cleanup.
 - c. Best way to distribute?

Sylvia – You want to make sure that the community knows who to contact or where they can get information. Start with what you have heard asked the most.

Peter – The question he gets most is, “Okay, bottled water has been cut-off, should it have been?” Maybe you should include a simplified statement of where residents fit into the spectrum with an explanation of what that means. Keep it simple, but don’t go into the history since we have given out so much history already.

Sylvia – Is there an easier way for people to find out the information?

Swanee – People that have had their wells tested and feel that they were cut-off unfairly. There should be a contact or link to PCAG, SMNA, RWQCB, STATE to be able to address their concerns.

Sylvia – When this information goes out, you need to be careful not to send out alarm or panic. The fact sheet needs to be in an identified area.

Tom – Also agrees that it should be selective.

Thea – Clarified that all the people who have had bottled water termination have received letters from RWQCB with contact information. This fact sheet is more to explain exactly who is getting bottled water, why they are receiving it and what criteria is being used. It would help

residents understand what clean-up involves and the criteria used to determine who receives replacement water.

Sylvia – Some community members have expressed that going with a different bottled water provider may be cheaper. Maybe the fact sheet could include other providers they could contact to continue their water or even labs to contact if they are not satisfied with the lab results.

Craig – recommended using only the list that includes companies that are accredited with the State

Thea – Everyone is saying they pay a different rate.

Discussion on the various factors that could be involved in determining rate: number of people in the household, household vs. agricultural usage, monthly vs. once in awhile.

Terry – The fact sheet should identify the agency that people can go to for the most accurate answer to their specific areas in question.

Hector – We want to be able to help as much as we can. We would like to know where to send people's calls to give them the most effective agency.

Terry – How many calls do you get?

Thea – 80 in the last couple of months.

Tom – The District gets 1-5 phone calls a week

Sylvia – Also receives 1-5 phone calls a week. She said our membership is about 50/50 for being on-line. There are many areas that could be addressed:

- For your fact sheet we should identify what phone numbers agencies want to provide the community – should be addressed to the agencies directly.
- Why the different numbers are given should be addressed.
- Agencies they can address for health issues should also be addressed.
- Somehow need to let them know what the current results are for their wells.
- Are they supposed to receive bottled water or not.
- Is the well going to continue to be monitored
- How often will the well be monitored

People have to see things over and over again before it is absorbed.

Public Question: What happens after your bottled water is terminated?

Thea - Olin gets the result and confirms whether or not the number reading is valid. If the criteria to continue bottled water are met – the bottled water should be reinstated immediately. If the well is tested above the cut-off limit and the water is not reinstated, the issue should be addressed with RWQCB.

Sylvia – Is Olin terminating bottled water prior to getting the sample data results from the lab?

Thea – It could be between 8-10 weeks after sample is collected before the water is reinstated.

Public Comment – People are not getting their results back.

Thea – Olin wasn't getting their results for 6-8 weeks due to lab and QA/QC (analytical work) done prior to getting back to the public. Because not so many samples are being submitted to the labs it should take less time for Olin to get back to people.

Sylvia – If Olin has taken a sample (and it's the 4th one) and then right after, send out a letter based on the last test, how can they do it sooner than 6-8 weeks?

Thea/Hector – Olin receives the preliminary report 2-3 weeks after it is submitted.

Sylvia – Is the preliminary data the factor that determines when the letter gets sent out

Thea/Hector – Olin sees that data and is just waiting for the QA/QC to verify their data is correct

Sylvia – Is there a map, that is easily accessible by the public, to determine well monitoring schedule and proximity to a well that test above 6ppb?

Peter/Thea – No, not since 9/11 due to confidentiality rules.

Thea – The quarterly monitoring reports show all the well locations/well id numbers/ tables and the well id #s with the data and are posted on the website or in their library.

Sylva – Yes, but is it accessible to the public?

Peter – How long (per the order) is it that Olin must send the final data information to the people whose wells have been sampled.

Thea – It is mostly between Olin and the well owner, and not specified in the RWQCB orders.

Swanee – One of the technical outreach summaries has some items that could be used such as: a citizens guide to attenuation, reverse osmosis, etc.

Eric – We are just trying to find another avenue

Public Comment – if the reports are over 1000 pages, people aren't going to read them.

Eric – It would be helpful (to us) if the public or community that has questions, attend these kinds of public meetings so we can address responses directly to the whole community.

Craig – As the problem goes on for a long period of time, unless there are new issues, or unless people are personally or deeply affected, there is ebb and flow. This is why this kind of outreach is important right now.

Eric – What about making the Fact Sheet more topical.

Sylvia – We could use a “Newsletter” type of approach and make it topical. It could be circulated through the Post Office, grocery stores, realtors, public libraries, involve churches.

We could resend the “Newsletter” every six months or so. The idea of a newsletter of sorts may not be a bad idea.

Peter/Terry – Since it is a select group – those with affected wells/or bottled water/terminated bottled water, unless it is mailed, it may not be read.

Sylvia – since the plume is moving, it should be done in other ways to reach a broader audience.

Swanee – Agreed that other areas may also benefit from the information.

Terry – Terry asked Jim Ashcroft if the City of Morgan Hill gets any calls.

Jim Ashcroft, City of Morgan Hill – Usually only 1 or 2 a week and only in response to news articles people have read.

Bob – Are there pamphlets or other avenues that the City uses to get information out?

Jim – No.

Bob – Since many do not have access to computers, there should be other ways to get information out.

RWQCB - Hector – The “Feasibility Report” from Olin is due 12/6, a “Clean-up Work Plan for area 1” is due 12/6, and the “Plume Migration Feasibility Study” is also due 12/6.

Bob – Do you receive the results of the ongoing testing? Folks are at different times for the start of their quarters. Do you see a trend of going up/down in various zones?

Hector – We have not seen any significant changes in the most recent quarters. The concentrations seem to be fairly stable. Whether RWQCB sees the data before affected well owners, he does not know. He assumes it's about the same time.

Thea – Generally RWQCB only sees the samples on a quarterly basis. The trends are going up a little. The RWQCB will be reviewing the most current monitoring report: East of Site Report Comment letter, the first week of December. The comment letter will be summarizing the East of Site Report and the Groundwater Monitoring Report and the 2006 Groundwater Monitoring Report.

Swanee – RE: the Northeast Groundwater Flow Assessment Letter – Page 3 and 4 December 8th, 2004 Order #13267 requiring investigation of the northeast flow issued to Olin: the water board rescinded the 2004 requirement for the northeast flow in the Olin Progress Report #50 dated 10/10/2006.

Hector – They recently issued orders to Olin that the tasks in the 12/8/04 requirements have been satisfied, it does not mean the work is going to stop.

Thea – The order required wells, that task has been met. This does not mean the work will stop.

Swanee – Do we have access to reports for the people whose wells have the Ion exchange system in place? For example: wells being tested to see if the system is working. Is PCAG getting the results?

Eric – Olin has a monitoring agreement with the people they have provided the IE (Ion Exchange) treatment system to. They have an obligation to those people to report to them on the findings of those wells. The water being treated is below detection.

Sylvia and Craig – concurred with Greg.

Swanee – Does anyone know how much of the percentage of the 130 million gallons of water refers to?

Greg – That amount is the majority of the water at the affected site. The water has been cleaned to non-detect.

Peter – The San Martin County Water District & the West San Martin Water Works companies have ION exchange systems that are monitored monthly.

Tom – Olin does not operate the San Martin County Water District.

Greg – City of Morgan Hill has information regarding test results of their municipal wells on their website.

Jim – Total number of gallons is not on the website. All water is consumed and used.

For the 2 wells that have the Ion exchange system in place, RWQCB has the report results from DHS.

- B. **Sylvia** – Regarding the DHS hearing: Sylvia was not able to attend. Does anyone have any input?

Craig – (3rd hand) – A colleague took time to listen to the briefing. Some of the statewide environmental groups were calling for the DHS to postpone the setting of the MCL until the PHG is finalized. It can't be lower than the PHG. But there are other areas where the MCL could be very useful. The moment OEHHA resets the PHG, DHS will swiftly reset the MCL. They could set the MCL now, but it would set it at 6 pbb.

Sylvia – After the CDC report, PCAG felt that the PHG should be lowered. However, since we don't have an MCL, Olin uses other numbers in their reports, (such as 11 & 24ppb which were in the last Feasibility Study Report). Therefore we decided it would be better to encourage DHS to set the MCL at 6ppb so we have a 'top' number for now. At the same time, we encourage OEHHA to lower the PHG based on the most current research and DHS to do the same in a timely manner.

- C. **Mr. Peekma** – Questions regarding the analytical results and the variability. Mr. Peekma discussed his table that depicts the analytical breakdown of typical drinking water. His article, "What is Typical Drinking Water?" was distributed for the discussion.

IV. Additional Topics

Tom – Tracy is representing the group in a Groundwater Guardian conference. He will defer to Tracy's report when she returns.

- A. **Ion –Exchange Certification Update** – Siemens has bought out US Filter - There have been a few transmittals to and responses from DHS regarding certification regulations.
- B. **Perchlorate Background and Source Study** – A vendor has been selected. Expected finalization of the Quality Assurance Project Plan is first quarter of 2008. This study will also determine if there a non-zero background for the Llagas/Subbasin. There are places where Perchlorate occurs naturally in rocks and minerals and in rainfall. Testing will determine whether there is natural perchlorate or another source such as imported fertilizer from Chile. Chlorate has been used as a herbicide, and perchlorate is a byproduct of that substance. The source study will determine whether we can separate different manmade sources as well as determining whether there is naturally occurring perchlorate. Locus Technologies is well known for cleaning up Superfund sites in Santa Clara Valley and has been selected competitively to do sampling from wells with perchlorate.
- C. **Recharge Project** – Church ponds – increasing recharge can have affect on Perchlorate in nearby wells. Determining whether a wedge of clean water will buffer the Municipal water system in Gilroy. A Feasibility Study will evaluate acceptable solutions for diverting flow from Llagas Creek to the Church ponds to achieve beneficial impacts on perchlorate in a manner that will also not harm fish and wildlife. .

- D. **Future projects: State and Tribal Assistance Grants** – Finding matching funds from non-federal funds remains a challenge. Currently looking for a 45% match, need approximately \$3 million. Tennant well, Nordstrom Park well and San Pedro wells all have 4pbb perchlorate, which the City of Morgan Hill has deemed to be the threshold for Municipal wellhead clean-up. Last month President Bush signed the Heritage Act which has included authorization for Congress to fund Perchlorate clean-up. The Heritage Act will need to be followed by an appropriations bill to obtain funding, which may also cover treatment costs retroactively. The expected completion of this study is end of 2007.

V. **PCAG Meeting – Friday, December 8, 2006, 2:00 – 4:00 PM – CANCELLED –**

VI. **Next Meeting February, 2, 2007, 2:00 – 4:00 PM**

Suggested Agenda Topics?

VII. **Adjourn / Hall Cleanup**

Repositories: Morgan Hill Library (Hardcopy); Gavilan College – Morgan Hill Branch (CD's & assistance)

Websites: www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/ & www.smneighbor.org & www.valleywater.org

COMMENT: If you cannot attend, please notify Sylvia at sylviaLRS@hotmail.com or (408) 683-2667